

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112(2) as allegedly being indefinite.

Claims 1-3, 6 and 9-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Yasuda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,842,371) (hereinafter "Yasuda et al.") in view of Saishu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,949,391) (hereinafter "Saishu et al.").

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants have amended claims 1 and 9 to further define the invention. Accordingly, claims 1-3, 6 and 9-12 remain pending in this application for further consideration with claims 4, 5, 7, 8, 13 and 14 being withdrawn from further consideration.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the limitation of "so as to improve response characteristics of the ferroelectric liquid crystal" in each of claims 1 and 9 allegedly causes insufficient antecedent basis. Since Applicants have amended the claims 1 and 9 by deleting the limitation, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-3, 6 and 9-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Yasuda et al. in view of Saishu et al. To the extent that the Examiner may

consider the rejection to apply to the newly amended claims, it is respectfully traversed as being based upon a combination of the applied references that neither teaches nor suggests the novel combination of features now clearly recited in the claims.

With regard to independent claim 1, as newly amended, Applicants respectfully submit that Yasuda et al. and Saishu et al., whether taken individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest the claimed combination including at least a recited feature of “constantly maintaining a voltage of a ferroelectric liquid crystal cell of the ferroelectric liquid crystal display device during the electric field alignment.” This feature is fully supported by at least paragraph [0066] of the specification.

The present invention supplies voltage of opposite polarity to the adjacent data lines while constantly maintaining a voltage of ferroelectric liquid crystal cell during the electric field alignment. According to the above-mentioned features, it is possible to compensate for a voltage necessary for the electric field alignment even though the voltage is not sufficiently supplied to the ferroelectric liquid crystal cell by the low voltage holding characteristic of the ferroelectric liquid crystal.

The Office Action alleges that a combination of Yasuda et al. and Saishu et al. renders the present invention obvious. In particular, the Office Action cites Yasuda et al. to teach “supplying voltages [Fig. 4; d] of opposite polarity to the adjacent data lines during the electric field alignment while maintaining a voltage [Fig. 4; e-j] of a liquid crystal cell of the liquid crystal display device during the electric field alignment (see Column 8, Line 67 – Column 9, Line 49).” In contrast to the present invention of newly-amended independent claim 1, Yasuda et al. merely discloses in Figs. 4(e) to 4(j) a plurality of **varying** driving voltages applied to the

counter electrode 103 of the liquid crystal cells. Yasuda et al. fails to teach or suggest **constantly** maintaining these driving voltages. In other words, Applicants respectfully submit that Yasuda et al. fails to teach or suggest the feature of “constantly maintaining a voltage of a ferroelectric liquid crystal cell of the ferroelectric liquid crystal display device during the electric field alignment,” as recited by newly-amended independent claim 1.

In addition, the Office Action does not rely upon Saishu et al. to remedy the above-noted deficiencies of Yasuda et al. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that Saishu et al. cannot remedy the deficiencies of Yasuda et al. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Yasuda et al. and Saishu et al., whether taken individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest the claimed combination including the feature of “constantly maintaining a voltage of a ferroelectric liquid crystal cell of the ferroelectric liquid crystal display device during the electric field alignment,” as recited by newly-amended independent claim 1.

For similar reasons as those set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that Yasuda et al. and Saishu et al., whether taken individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest the claimed combination including at least a feature of “constantly maintaining a voltage supplied to ferroelectric liquid crystal cells during the electric field alignment,” as recited by newly-amended independent claim 9.

MPEP § 2143.03 instructs that “[t]o establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 409 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974).” Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action has not established a prima facie obviousness rejection.

For at least the reasons as those discussed above, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of independent claims 1 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn because Yasuda et al. and Saishu et al., whether taken individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every feature of newly-amended independent claims 1 and 9. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of dependent claims 2-3, 6 and 10-12 should also be withdrawn at least because of their dependencies upon respective independent claims 1 and 9 and for the reasons set forth above.

With no other rejections pending, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 1-3, 6 and 9-12 are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments, reconsideration and the timely allowance of all pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under

37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such as an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: 

Xiaobin You

Reg. No. L0112

Date: April 10, 2007

CUSTOMER NO. 09629

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

Telephone: (202) 739-3000

Facsimile: (202) 739-3001